arXiv:1608.07014v1 [math.ST] 25 Aug 2016

SEQUENTIAL MULTIPLE TESTING WITH GENERALIZED ERROR CONTROL: AN ASYMPTOTIC OPTIMALITY THEORY

By Y. Song and G. Fellouris

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

The multiple testing problem is considered under two different error metrics, when the data for the various hypotheses are collected sequentially in independent streams. In the first one, the probability of making at least k mistakes, of any kind, is controlled. In the second, the probabilities of at least k_1 false positives and at least k_2 false negatives are simultaneously controlled below two arbitrary levels. For each formulation, we characterize the optimal expected sample size to a first-order asymptotic approximation as the error probabilities vanish (at arbitrary rates). More importantly, for each formulation we propose a novel, feasible sequential multiple testing procedure that achieves the optimal asymptotic performance under every possible signal configuration. These asymptotic optimality results are established under weak distributional assumptions which hold beyond the case of i.i.d. observations in the streams.

1. Introduction. In the historical development of multiple testing, the focus was on the design of testing procedures in which the probability of at least one false positive is guaranteed to be below a user-specified level (see, e.g., Marcus, Eric and Gabriel (1976); Hommel (1988); Holm (1979)). With the acknowledgement that this requirement is prohibitive for the detection of weak signals when the number of hypotheses is large, the emphasis has shifted to alternative, less stringent error metrics. One line of research has focused on controlling functions of the so-called false discovery proportion, i.e., the proportion of false positives in the total number of rejected nulls, such as its expectation (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995), or its quantiles (Lehmann and Romano, 2005). Another line of research has focused on a flexible generalization of the classical familywise error rate, proposed by Hommel and Hoffmann (1988); Lehmann and Romano (2005), which controls the probability of at least k false positives.

Various multiple testing procedures have been proposed to control these less stringent error metrics, see, e.g., Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001); Ro-

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62L10

Keywords and phrases: Multiple testing, sequential analysis, asymptotic optimality, generalized familywise error rates, mis-classification rate

mano and Shaikh (2006); Romano and Wolf (2007); we refer to Guo et al. (2014) for an exhaustive survey on the vast literature on this area. Most of this literature has focused on the control of a certain metric of false positives, ignoring the issue of power, i.e., the need to maximize the number of correct discoveries. A more holistic approach to multiple testing has been adopted in Lehmann, Romano and Shaffer (2005); Storey (2007); Sun and Cai (2009); Peña, Habiger and Wu (2011), where the goal is to maximize the number of true positives subject to a control on false positives, generalizing the Neyman-Pearson paradigm. We should also refer to Bogdan et al. (2011), where the false negatives were also incorporated into the risk function under a Bayesian decision theoretic framework.

Unlike the previously mentioned papers, in this work we assume that the data for the various hypotheses are collected *sequentially*, and that the goal is to stop sampling and make a decision as soon as possible, while controlling certain error metric. This framework goes back to the foundational work of Wald (1945), and is motivated by applications where a real-time decision is required. In fact, in the context of multiple testing, there are two distinct categories of sequential procedures, which are motivated by different applications. In the first one, we are allowed to stop sampling different data streams at different times (see, e.g., Bartroff and Song (2014); Malloy and Nowak (2014); Bartroff (2014)). In the second category, it is assumed that we stop sampling all data streams at the same time (see, e.g., De and Baron (2012a,b)). The focus of the current paper is on the second category.

It is well known that in the case of sequential observations, it is possible to guarantee stronger error control than in the fixed sample size framework. In this work we consider two error metrics, which lead to different problem formulations. In the first one, we control the probability of at least k mistakes, of any kind. We will refer to this error metric as *generalized mis-classification rate*; since when $k = 1$, it recovers the classical *mis-classification rate*, i.e., the probability of not correctly identifying the true subset of signals, which has been considered by Malloy and Nowak (2014); Li, Nitinawarat and Veeravalli (2014). In the second formulation, we distinguish between false positives and false negatives, and require the probabilities of at least k_1 false positives and at least k_2 false negatives to be below two arbitrary, user-specified levels. When $k_1 = k_2 = 1$, this reduces to the control of the classical *familywise error rates of both kinds*; thus we will refer to this constraint as control of the *generalized familywise error rates*.

Bartroff and Lai (2010) were the first to propose a sequential multiple testing procedure that controls the classical familywise error rate of false positives. In subsequent works, sequential procedures were proposed that

can control *classical* familywise error rates of *both* types ($k_1, k_2 = 1$) (De and Baron, 2012a,b; Bartroff and Song, 2014), and these procedures were later refined to control *generalized* familywise error rates ($k_1, k_2 \geq 1$) (De and Baron, 2015; Bartroff, 2014). In sequential setup, the goal is to find a procedure that guarantees certain error metric, and that requires (asymptotically) minimal expected sample size; such procedure is said to be (asymptotically) optimal. Above works did not establish optimality property of the proposed procedures. In Song and Fellouris (2016), the Intersection rule, proposed in De and Baron (2012a), was shown to achieve the best possible asymptotic performance, to a first-order asymptotic approximation, in the case of *classical* familywise error rates (i.e. $k_1 = k_2 = 1$). To our knowledge, the problem of finding asymptotically optimal sequential multiple testing procedures is open in the case of *generalized* error rates.

An approach to the design of asymptotically optimal sequential multiple testing procedure is to interpret the simultaneous solution of J testing problems as a classification problem with 2^J hypotheses, each corresponding to a different signal configuration. Then, one can "borrow" the resulting procedures and results from the mature theory of sequential classification (see, e.g., Armitage (1950); Lorden (1977); Dragalin, Tartakovsky and Veeravalli (1999, 2000)). However, there are two main obstacles in this approach. First, the existing asymptotic theory in sequential classification applies only under the regime where the probability of not identifying the correct subset of signals goes to 0, which is not the case for generalized error rates. Second, such procedures do not incorporate the parallel structure of the multiple testing problem and are not feasible from a practical point of view.

In the current paper, we address the question of asymptotic optimality under generalized error metrics. The main contributions of this work are the following: first, for each formulation, we establish an asymptotic lower bound on the optimal performance as the error probabilities vanish (at arbitrary rates). Second, in each case, we propose a novel, feasible sequential procedure that achieves the lower bound under each possible signal configuration. Thus, we characterize the optimal asymptotic performance, which is achieved by the proposed rules. Third, we show that alternative procedures, such as the Intersection rule, are asymptotically optimal only in very special cases, a claim that is corroborated by simulation studies. These results hold as long as the log-likelihood ratio process in each stream satisfies a certain asymptotic stability property, beyond the case of i.i.d. observations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate two versions of the sequential multiple testing problem. We consider the case of the generalized mis-classification rate in Section 3, and the case of the generalized

familywise error rates in Section 4. In Sections 5 and 6, we present simulation studies for the two formulations. We discuss future work in Section 7, and present some technical proofs and two additional lemmas in the Appendix.

2. Problem formulation. Consider J *independent* streams of observations, $X^j = \{X_n^j : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $j \in [J] := \{1, \dots, J\}$ and $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. For each $j \in [J]$, let P^j denote the distribution of the sequence in the j^{th} stream, X^j, and consider two simple hypotheses for it,

$$\mathsf{H}_0^j : \mathsf{P}^j = \mathsf{P}_0^j \quad \text{versus} \quad \mathsf{H}_1^j : \mathsf{P}^j = \mathsf{P}_1^j, \tag{1}$$

where P_0^j and P_1^j are distinct probability measures. We will say that there is "noise" in the j^{th} stream under P_0^j and "signal" under P_1^j. We denote by P_A the underlying probability measure, i.e., the distribution of $(X^1, \dots, X^J)$, when $A \subset [J]$ is the true subset of signals. Due to the assumption of independence among the streams, P_A takes the following product form:

$$\mathsf{P}_A := \bigotimes_{j=1}^{J} \mathsf{P}^j; \qquad \mathsf{P}^j = \begin{cases} \mathsf{P}_0^j, & \text{if } j \notin A \\ \mathsf{P}_1^j, & \text{if } j \in A \end{cases} . \tag{2}$$

Our focus is on the simultaneous solution of the J hypothesis testing problems, H_0^j versus H_1^j, $j \in [J]$, when the data from all streams become available *sequentially*. Specifically, our goal is to stop sampling and make a decision as soon as possible, at the same time in all streams, while guaranteeing certain error control requirements. Formally, a *multiple testing procedure* is a pair $\delta = (T, D)$ that consists of an $\{\mathcal{F}_n\}$-stopping time T, at which we stop sampling in all streams, and an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable decision rule, D, which describes the final decision upon stopping. Here, $\mathcal{F}_n$ is the σ-field generated by all streams up to time n, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, $X_n = (X_n^1, \dots, X_n^J)$ being the observed vector at time n. We will think of the decision rule D in two ways. First, as a J-dimensional vector $(D^1, \dots, D^J)$ taking values in $\{0, 1\}^J$, with the understanding that hypothesis H_i^j is selected on the event $\{D^j = i, T < \infty\}$, $i = 0, 1$, $j \in [J]$. Second, as the subset of alternative hypotheses that are selected upon stopping, i.e. $\{j \in [J] : \ D^j = 1\}$.

In this work, we consider two distinct error control requirements, which lead to two different problems. In the first one, we control the probability of *committing at least k mistakes*, where k is an integer such that $1 \le k < J$. To be more specific, when A is the true subset of signals, a decision rule D makes at least k mistakes when $|A \triangle D| \ge k$, where $\triangle$ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets, i.e., $A \triangle D := (A \setminus D) \cup (D \setminus A)$, and

$|\cdot|$ denotes set-cardinality. In this context, the class of multiple testing procedures of interest is of the form

$$\Delta_k(\alpha) := \{(T, D) : \mathsf{P}_A(|A \triangle D| \geq k) \leq \alpha \quad \forall\, A \subset [J]\}\,, \tag{3}$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a user-specified level. When $k = 1$, we recover the classical *mis-classification rate*, i.e., the probability of not identifying the correct subset of signals. Thus, we will refer to this form of error control as the control of *generalized mis-classification rate*.

The first formulation does not distinguish between false positives (rejecting the null when it is correct) and false negatives (accepting the null when it is false). In applications, practitioners may have very different levels of tolerance to these two kinds of errors. Thus, in the second formulation we consider procedures that control the probabilities of at least k_1 false positives and at least k_2 false negatives below user-specified, target levels α and β, respectively, where $k_1, k_2 \geq 1$ are given integers such that $k_1 + k_2 \leq J$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$. To be more specific, when the true subset of signals is A, a decision rule D makes at least k_1 false positives when $|D \setminus A| \geq k_1$ and at least k_2 false negatives when $|A \setminus D| \geq k_2$. Therefore, in this context we restrict ourselves to multiple testing procedures in the following class:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha, \beta) = \{(T, D) : \mathsf{P}_A(|D \setminus A| \geq k_1) \leq \alpha \\ \text{and} \quad \mathsf{P}_A(|A \setminus D| \geq k_2) \leq \beta \quad \forall\, A \subset [J]\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

When $k_1 = k_2 = 1$, it corresponds to the control of the classical familywise error rates of both types. Thus, we refer to this constraint as control of *generalized familywise error rates*.

Our main contribution in this paper is that, for each of the two formulations under consideration, we propose novel, feasible multiple testing procedures that achieve the smallest possible (expected) sample size under every possible signal configuration, i.e.,

$$\inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)} \mathsf{E}_A[T], \quad \forall\, A \subset [J],$$

to a first-order asymptotic approximation as $\alpha \to 0$ and $\max\{\alpha, \beta\} \to 0$, respectively. In order to do so, we will need to make certain distributional assumptions on each data stream.

2.1. *Assumptions.* For each $j \in [J]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we assume that the probability measures P_0^j and P_1^j, defined in (1), are equivalent when restricted to the σ-algebra generated by the data in the j^{th} stream up to time n,

$\mathcal{F}_n^j := \sigma(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j)$, and we denote the corresponding log-likelihood ratio (LLR) statistic as follows:

$$\lambda^j(n) := \log \frac{d\mathsf{P}_1^j}{d\mathsf{P}_0^j}(\mathcal{F}_n^j).$$

For any $A, C \subset [J]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\lambda^{A,C}(n)$ the LLR process of P_A versus P_C when both measures are restricted to $\mathcal{F}_n$, i.e. the σ-algebra generated by the data in all streams up to time n. Due to the assumption of independence across streams (recall (2)), it takes the following form:

$$\lambda^{A,C}(n) := \log \frac{d\mathsf{P}_A}{d\mathsf{P}_C}(\mathcal{F}_n) = \sum_{j \in A \setminus C} \lambda^j(n) - \sum_{j \in C \setminus A} \lambda^j(n). \tag{5}$$

In order to define multiple testing procedures that terminate almost surely and guarantee the desired error control, it suffices to assume that for each stream $j \in [J]$, the probability measures P_0^j and P_1^j are singular on $\mathcal{F}_\infty^j := \sigma(\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_n^j)$, which implies that

$$\mathsf{P}_0^j \left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda^j(n) = -\infty \right) = \mathsf{P}_1^j \left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \lambda^j(n) = \infty \right) = 1 \quad \forall j \in [J]. \tag{6}$$

However, in order to establish their asymptotic optimality, we need to impose additional distributions assumptions. Thus, for each $j \in [J]$ we will assume that there are positive numbers $\{\mathcal{I}_1^j, \mathcal{I}_0^j : j \in [J]\}$ such that the following Strong Law of Large Numbers (SLLN) holds:

$$\mathsf{P}_1^j \left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda^j(n)}{n} = \mathcal{I}_1^j \right) = \mathsf{P}_0^j \left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda^j(n)}{n} = -\mathcal{I}_0^j \right) = 1. \tag{7}$$

The two numbers $\mathcal{I}_1^j$ and $\mathcal{I}_0^j$ determine the inherent difficulty of the local testing problem in the j^{th} stream. From (5) and (7) it follows that for any two subsets $A, C \subset [J]$ we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A \left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\lambda^{A,C}(n)}{n} = \mathcal{I}^{A,C} \right) = 1; \quad \mathcal{I}^{A,C} := \sum_{i \in A \setminus C} \mathcal{I}_1^i + \sum_{j \in C \setminus A} \mathcal{I}_0^j, \tag{8}$$

and we can think of $\mathcal{I}^{A,C}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{C,A}$ as the quantities that determine the inherent difficulty in discriminating between P_A and P_C.

The SLLN (7) will turn out to be a *sufficient* assumption for our asymptotic optimality theory when the LLR process in each stream has *independent, not necessarily identically distributed, increments*. When this is not

the case, we need to make a further assumption on the rate of convergence of the SLLN in (7), and assume that for every $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}_1^j \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \lambda^j(n) - \mathcal{I}_1^j \right| > \epsilon \right) < \infty, \ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}_0^j \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \lambda^j(n) + \mathcal{I}_0^j \right| > \epsilon \right) < \infty. \tag{9}$$

Condition (9) is known as complete convergence (Hsu and Robbins, 1947), and is a stronger assumption than (7), due to Borel-Cantelli lemma. Clearly, it also implies for any two sets $A, C \subset [J]$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}_A \left(\left| \frac{\lambda^{A,C}(n)}{n} - \mathcal{I}^{A,C} \right| > \epsilon \right) < \infty.$$

Finally, we collect some notations that will be used extensively throughout the paper: "LLR" stands for log-likelihood ratio; C_k^J will denote the binomial coefficient $\binom{J}{k}$, i.e., the number of subsets of size k from a set of size J; $a \bigvee b$ will represent $\max\{a, b\}$; $x \sim y$ will mean that $\lim_{y\to\infty} x/y = 1$ and $x(b) = o(1)$ that $\lim_{b\to\infty} x(b) = 0$.

3. Generalized misclassification rate. In this section we consider the sequential multiple testing problem when the error metric of interest is the *generalized mis-classification rate* and the procedures of interest belong to the class $\Delta_k(\alpha)$, defined in (3). We carry out the following program: first, we propose a novel, sequential multiple testing procedure, and show how it can be designed to control any given, non-asymptotic, level of the generalized mis-classification rate. Then, we show that the proposed rule is asymptotically optimal. This is done by first obtaining an asymptotic lower bound on the optimal expected sample size and then showing that this is attained by the proposed scheme.

3.1. *Sum-Intersection rule.* For any given time $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote the (increasingly) ordered sequence of the *absolute values* of the local LLR statistics, $\{|\lambda^j(n)| : j \in [J]\}$, as follows:

$$\widetilde{\lambda}^1(n) \leq \ldots \leq \widetilde{\lambda}^J(n).$$

We can think of $\widetilde{\lambda}^1(n)$ (resp. $\widetilde{\lambda}^J(n)$) as the least (resp. most) "significant" local test statistic at time n, in the sense that it provides the weakest (resp. strongest) evidence in favor of either the null or the alternative. The proposed multiple testing procedure, $\delta_S(b) = (T_S(b), D_S(b))$ works as follows: it stops sampling at the first time $T_S(b)$ that the *sum of the k least significant*

local test statistics exceeds a given positive threshold b, and rejects the null in each stream with a positive LLR upon stopping. Formally,

$$T_S(b) := \inf\left\{n \geq 1 : \sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\lambda}^i(n) \geq b\right\}, \; D_S(b) := \left\{j \in [J] : \; \lambda^j(T_S) > 0\right\}.$$

Hereafter, we suppress the dependence on the threshold whenever necessary to lighten the notation.

When $k = 1$, the proposed rule stops when the absolute values of all local LLR statistics simultaneously exceed b; thus, it is a special case of the Intersection rule (De and Baron (2012a)), which is discussed in detail in Subsection 3.5. When $k > 1$, the proposed rule is different from the Intersection rule, but shares a similar flavor, as it stops at the first time T_S that all *sums* of the form $\sum_{j\in A} |\lambda^j(T_S)|$, with $A \subset [J]$ and $|A| = k$, are simultaneously above b. For this reason, we will refer to δ_S as the *Sum-Intersection rule*.

3.2. *Error control of the Sum-Intersection rule.* For any choice of the threshold b, it is clear that the Sum-Intersection rule terminates almost surely under each possible signal configuration as long as condition (6) holds. In the next theorem we show how to select the threshold b in order to guarantee the desired error control for the Sum-Intersection rule. We stress that no additional distributional assumptions are needed for this purpose.

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume (6) holds. For any $b > 0$ and $A \subset [J]$ we have*

$$\mathsf{P}_A(|A \triangle D_S(b)| \geq k) \leq C_k^J \, e^{-b}.$$

Therefore, $\delta_S(b_\alpha) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$ where

$$b_\alpha = |\log(\alpha)| + \log(C_k^J). \tag{10}$$

PROOF. Fix $A \subset [J]$ and $b > 0$. Observe that the event $\{|A \triangle D_S| \geq k\}$ occurs if and only if there exist $B_1 \subset A$ and $B_2 \subset A^c$ such that $|B_1|+|B_2| = k$ and the following event occurs:

$$\Gamma(B_1, B_2) := \left\{D_S^i = 0, \; D_S^j = 1, \; \forall \, i \in B_1, j \in B_2\right\}.$$

Since there are C_k^J such pairs, due to Boole's inequality it suffices to show that the probability of each of these events is bounded by e^{-b}. To this end, fix $B_1 \subset A, B_2 \subset A^c$ such that $|B_1| + |B_2| = k$ and consider the set $C = (A \setminus B_1) \cup B_2$. Then, with the change of measure $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_C$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(\Gamma(B_1, B_2)) = \mathsf{E}_C\left[\exp\left\{\lambda^{A,C}(T_S)\right\}; \Gamma(B_1, B_2)\right]. \tag{11}$$

For $i \in B_1$ we have $D_S^i = 0$, which implies $\lambda^i(T_S) \le 0$, and for $j \in B_2$ we have $D_S^j = 1$, which implies $\lambda^j(T_S) > 0$. Thus, on the event $\Gamma(B_1, B_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{A,C}(T_S) &= \sum_{i\in B_1} \lambda^i(T_S) - \sum_{j\in B_2} \lambda^j(T_S) \\ &= -\sum_{i\in B_1} |\lambda^i(T_S)| - \sum_{j\in B_2} |\lambda^j(T_S)| \le -\sum_{i=1}^{k} \widetilde{\lambda}^i(T_S) \le -b, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the first equality is due to (5), the first inequality follows from the definition of $\widetilde{\lambda}^i$'s, and the second from the definition of the stopping time T_S. Thus, the proof is complete in view of (11). □

3.3. *Asymptotic lower bound on the optimal performance.* To establish the asymptotic optimality of the Sum-Intersection rule, we first need to obtain an asymptotic lower bound on the optimal expected sample size for procedures in the class $\Delta_k(\alpha)$. Intuitively, when A is the true subset of signals, it is determined by the "wrong" subset that is the most difficult to distinguish from A. In the context of generalized misclassification rate, "wrong" subsets under P_A are those that differ from A in at least k components, i.e., subsets that do *not* belong to

$$\mathcal{U}_k(A) := \{C \subset [J] : |A \triangle C| < k\}.$$

Then, recalling the definition of $\mathcal{I}^{A,C}$ in (8), it is reasonable to conjecture that the information-theoretic quantity that describes the inherent difficulty of the multiple testing problem under P_A is

$$\mathcal{D}(A,k) := \min\left\{\mathcal{I}^{A,C} : C \notin \mathcal{U}_k(A)\right\}. \tag{13}$$

It also admits the following convenient representation

$$\mathcal{D}(A,k) = \sum_{i\in[k]} \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}^{(i)}(A),$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}^{(1)}(A) \le \ldots \le \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}^{(J)}(A)$ is the increasingly ordered sequence of the information numbers $\{\mathcal{I}_1^i : i \in A\} \cup \{\mathcal{I}_0^j : j \notin A\}$. The fundamental role of $\mathcal{D}(A,k)$ for the class $\Delta_k(\alpha)$ are formalized in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.2. *Suppose that the SLLN (7) holds. Then, for any $A \subset [J]$, we have as $\alpha \to 0$*

$$\inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T] \ge \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}(A,k)}(1 + o(1)). \tag{14}$$

In the special case of the *classical* mis-classification rate ($k = 1$), this result is implied by the well-known lower bounds on the expected sample size of a sequential classification procedure (T, D) that controls the probability $\mathsf{P}_A(D \neq A)$ below level α_A, for every $A \subset [J]$ (Lai, 1981; Tartakovsky, 1998). In particular, (14) follows from Theorem 2.2 in Tartakovsky (1998) by setting $\alpha_A = \alpha$ for every A. To lower bound $\mathsf{E}_A[T]$, a key step in their proof is to change measure from P_A to P_{A^*}, where A^* is chosen such that (i) A is a wrong subset under P_{A^*}, i.e., $A \notin \mathcal{U}_1(A^*)$, and (ii) A^* is close to A, in the sense that

$$\mathcal{I}^{A,A^*} = \min_{C \neq A} \mathcal{I}^{A,C} \equiv D(A, 1).$$

In order to prove Theorem 3.2 ($k \geq 1$), we extend this idea and apply a *battery* of change of measures. Specifically, for each "correct" subset $B \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)$ under P_A, we apply a separate change of measure $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_{B^*}$, where B^* is chosen such that (i) B is a wrong subset under P_{B^*}, i.e., $B \notin \mathcal{U}_k(B^*)$, and (ii) B^* is close to A, in the sense that $I^{A,B^*} \leq \mathcal{D}(A, k)$. The existence of such a B^* is guaranteed by the following lemma, whose proof can be found in the Appendix A.1.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $A, B \subset [J]$. Then there exists $B^* \subset [J]$ such that:*

$$(i) \quad |B \triangle B^*| \geq k, \qquad (ii) \quad I^{A,B^*} \leq \mathcal{D}(A, k).$$

With above lemma, we are now ready to prove Theorem 3.2.

PROOF. Fix $A \subset [J]$, $k \in [J]$, and set

$$\ell_\alpha := |\log(\alpha)|/\mathcal{D}(A, k), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

By Markov's inequality, for any stopping time T, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $q > 0$,

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T] \geq q\ell_\alpha \, \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha).$$

Thus, it suffices to show for every $q \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\liminf_{\alpha \to 0} \inf_{(T,D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha) \geq 1, \tag{15}$$

as this will imply that

$$\liminf_{\alpha \to 0} \frac{1}{\ell_\alpha} \inf_{(T,D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T] \geq q,$$

and the desired result follows by letting $q \to 1$. In order to prove (15), let us start by fixing arbitrary $\alpha, q \in (0,1)$ and $(T, D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$. Then,

$$1 - \alpha \leq \mathsf{P}_A(D \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)) = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)} \mathsf{P}_A(D = B). \tag{16}$$

Now, consider an arbitrary $B \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)$, and let $B^* \subset [J]$ be a set that satisfies the two conditions in Lemma 3.1. Then, $|B^* \triangle B| \geq k$, and consequently

$$\mathsf{P}_{B^*}(D = B) \leq \alpha. \tag{17}$$

We can now decompose the probability $\mathsf{P}_A(D = B)$ as follows:

$$\mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B^*}(T) < \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right); D = B\right) + \mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B^*}(T) \geq \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right); D = B\right),$$

where η is an arbitrary constant in $(0,1)$. We denote the first term by I and second by II. For the first term, by a change of measure $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_{B^*}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{I} &= \mathsf{E}_{B^*}\left[\exp\{\lambda^{A,B^*}(T)\}\ ;\ \lambda^{A,B^*}(T) < \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right), D = B\right] \\ &\leq \frac{\eta}{\alpha}\mathsf{P}_{B^*}(D = B) \leq \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (17). For the second term, we have

$$\mathrm{II} \leq \mathsf{P}_A\left(T \leq q\frac{|\log\alpha|}{\mathcal{D}(A,k)},\ \lambda^{A,B^*}(T) \geq \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right)\right) + \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha, D = B).$$

By construction, B^* satisfies $\mathcal{I}^{A,B^*} \leq \mathcal{D}(A,k)$; thus the first term in the right-hand side is bounded above by

$$\epsilon_{\alpha,B^*} = \mathsf{P}_A\left(T \leq q\frac{|\log\alpha|}{I^{A,B^*}},\quad \lambda^{A,B^*}(T) \geq |\log\alpha| + \log(\eta)\right).$$

Due to the assumption that the SLLN (7) holds, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A\left(\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\lambda^{A,B^*}(n)}{n} = \mathcal{I}^{A,B^*}\right) = 1. \tag{18}$$

Therefore, by Lemma B.1, it follows that $\epsilon_{\alpha,B^*} \to 0$ as $\alpha \to 0$.

Putting everything together we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(D = B) \leq \eta + \epsilon_{\alpha,B^*} + \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha, D = B),$$

and summing over $B \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{P}_A(D \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)) &\leq |\mathcal{U}_k(A)|\eta + \epsilon_\alpha + \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha, D \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{U}_k(A)|\eta + \epsilon_\alpha + \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha),\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_\alpha = \sum_{B \in \mathcal{U}_k(A)} \epsilon_{\alpha,B^*} \to 0$ as $\alpha \to 0$. Due to (16), we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha) \geq\ 1 - \alpha - \epsilon_\alpha - |\mathcal{U}_k(A)|\eta.$$

Since $(T, D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$ is arbitrary and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ also arbitrary, taking the infimum over (T, D) and letting $\alpha \to 0$ we obtain

$$\liminf_{\alpha \to 0} \inf_{(T,D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{P}_A(T \geq q\ell_\alpha) \geq 1 - |\mathcal{U}_k(A)|\eta. \tag{19}$$

Finally, letting $\eta \to 0$ we obtain (15), which completes the proof. □

3.4. *Asymptotic optimality for the Sum-Intersection rule.* We can now establish the asymptotic optimality of the Sum-Intersection rule by showing that it attains the asymptotic lower bound of Theorem 3.2. We start by obtaining an asymptotic upper bound on the expected sample size of the Sum-Intersection rule for large values of the threshold b. The following fact about set operations will be needed:

$$\text{Let}\ \ A, B \subset [J]\ \ \text{and}\ \ C = A \triangle B\ .\ \text{Then}\ A \triangle C = B. \tag{20}$$

LEMMA 3.2. *Suppose that either the complete convergence (9) holds for each $j \in [J]$, or only the SLLN (7) holds and each λ^j has independent increments. Then, for any $A \subset [J]$, as $b \to \infty$ we have*

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_S(b)] \leq \frac{b(1 + o(1))}{\mathcal{D}(A, k)}. \tag{21}$$

PROOF. Fix $A \subset [J]$ and consider the stopping time

$$T^A(b) := \inf\left\{n \geq 1 : \lambda^{A,C}(n) \geq b \quad \forall\, C \notin \mathcal{U}_k(A)\right\}.$$

Under the conditions of the lemma, from Lemma B.2 in the Appendix it follows that $b \to \infty$ we have

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T^A(b)] \leq \frac{b\,(1 + o(1))}{\mathcal{D}(A, k)}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $T_S(b) \leq T^A(b)$ for any given $b > 0$. In what follows, we fix $b > 0$ and suppress the dependence on b. By the definition of the Sum-Intersection rule, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{i \in B} |\lambda^i(T^A)| \geq b, \quad \forall\, B \subset [J] :\ |B| = k. \tag{22}$$

To this end, fix $B \subset [J]$ with $|B| = k$ and set $C = A \triangle B$. Then, from (20) we have that $B = A \triangle C$. Since $|B| \geq k$, it follows that $C \notin \mathcal{U}_k(A)$, and by the definition of T^A we have $\lambda^{A,C}(T^A) \geq b$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} b \leq \lambda^{A,C}(T^A) &= \sum_{i \in A \setminus C} \lambda^i(T^A) - \sum_{j \in C \setminus A} \lambda^j(T^A) \\ &\leq \sum_{i \in A \,\triangle\, C} |\lambda^i(T^A)| = \sum_{i \in B} |\lambda^i(T^A)|. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete in view of (22). □

Based on Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.2, we are now ready to characterize the optimal asymptotic performance under every possible signal configuration, and at the same time to establish the asymptotic optimality of the Sum-Intersection rule.

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose that the conditions of Lemma 3.2 hold. If the threshold in the Sum-Intersection rule is selected such that $\delta_S \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$ and $b \sim |\log(\alpha)|$, e.g. as in (10), then for every $A \subset [J]$ we have as $\alpha \to 0$*

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_S] \sim \frac{|\log \alpha|}{\mathcal{D}(A,k)} \sim \inf_{(T,D) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T].$$

PROOF. From Lemma 3.2 it follows that if $b \sim |\log(\alpha)|$, as $\alpha \to 0$

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_S] \leq \frac{|\log \alpha|}{\mathcal{D}(A,k)}(1 + o(1)),$$

which proves that δ_S attains the asymptotic lower bound in Theorem 3.2. □

3.5. *Implications about the Intersection rule.* Let us now formally introduce the *Intersection rule* $\delta_I(a,b) = (T_I, D_I)$ (De and Baron, 2012a), where

$$\begin{aligned} T_I &:= \inf\left\{n \geq 1 : \lambda^j(n) \notin (-a,b) \quad \text{for every } j \in [J]\right\}, \\ D_I &:= \left\{j \in [J] :\ \lambda^j(T_I) > 0\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

It is clear that when $k = 1$, the proposed Sum-Intersection rule coincides with the Intersection rule when in the latter the two thresholds are equal, i.e. $a = b$. Therefore, Theorem 3.3 immediately implies that the Intersection rule $\delta_I(b, b)$ is asymptotically optimal with respect to the *classical* mis-classification rate ($k = 1$).

A more interesting question is whether the Intersection rule enjoys asymptotic optimality property in the case of the *generalized* mis-classification rate ($k \geq 1$). The following Corollary shows that this is indeed the case in the very specific situation where the testing problem in each stream is *symmetric*, in the sense that $\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I}^j$ for every $j \in [J]$, and at the same time the streams are *homogeneous*, in the sense that $\mathcal{I}^j = \mathcal{I}$ for every $j \in [J]$. In a more compact form, it is required that

$$\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I} \quad \text{for every} \quad j \in [J]. \tag{24}$$

When this quite restrictive assumption is violated, we will illustrate with a simulation study where the Intersection rule fails to be asymptotically optimal, which is presented in Section 6.2.

COROLLARY 3.1. *(i) Assume (6) holds. For any $b > 0$ and $A \subset [J]$,*

$$\mathsf{P}_A(|A \triangle D_I(b, b)|) \leq C_k^J \, e^{-kb}. \tag{25}$$

Thus, $\delta_I(b_\alpha, b_\alpha) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$ where

$$b_\alpha = \frac{|\log \alpha| + \log(C_k^J)}{k}. \tag{26}$$

(ii) Suppose that the conditions of Lemma 3.2 hold and that threshold b is selected such that $\delta_I(b, b) \in \Delta_k(\alpha)$ and $b \sim |\log \alpha|/k$, e.g., as in (26). If assumption (24) holds, then for any $A \subset [J]$ we have as $\alpha \to 0$ that

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_I] \sim \frac{|\log \alpha|}{k\mathcal{I}} \sim \inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_k(\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T].$$

PROOF. Fix $A \subset [J]$. The proof of part (i) is identical to that of Theorem 3.1 as long as we replace the inequalities in (12) by

$$-\sum_{i\in B_1} |\lambda^i(T_I)| - \sum_{j\in B_2} |\lambda^j(T_I)| \leq -kb.$$

In order to prove (ii), setting $k = 1$ in Lemma 3.2 we have as $b \to \infty$

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_I(b, b)] \leq \frac{b\,(1 + o(1))}{\min_{C\neq A} I^{A,C}}. \tag{27}$$

If condition (24) is satisfied, then $\min_{C\neq A} I^{A,C} = \mathcal{I}$. Therefore, if $b \sim |\log\alpha|/k$, from (27) we have that as $\alpha \to 0$

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_I] \leq \frac{|\log\alpha|}{k\mathcal{I}}(1+o(1)).$$

Further, this asymptotic upper bound agrees with the asymptotic lower bound in (14), since $\mathcal{D}(A,k) = k\mathcal{I}$ when condition (24) holds. Thus, the proof is complete. □

4. Generalized familywise error rates. In this section we consider the sequential multiple testing problem where the goal is to control the generalized familywise error rates *of both kinds*; that is, the procedures of interest belong to the class $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$, defined in (4). Specifically, for any given k_1 and k_2, we propose a novel, feasible procedure that belongs to the class $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$, and that is asymptotically optimal as α and β go to 0 at *arbitrary* rates. While we follow similar steps and ideas as in the previous section, the proposed procedure, as well as the proof of its asymptotic optimality, turn out to be much more complicated.

4.1. *Notation.* To describe the proposed multiple testing procedure, additional notations are needed. Thus, let $p(n)$ be the number of streams with strictly positive LLRs at time n; we denote by

$$0 < \widehat{\lambda}^1(n) \leq \ldots \leq \widehat{\lambda}^{p(n)}(n)$$

the (increasingly) ordered sequence of strictly positive LLRs at time n, i.e., $\{\lambda^j(n) : \lambda^j(n) > 0, j \in [J]\}$, and by $\widehat{i}_1(n),\ldots,\widehat{i}_{p(n)}(n)$ the corresponding stream indices, i.e.,

$$\lambda^{\widehat{i}_j(n)}(n) = \widehat{\lambda}^j(n), \quad \forall\, j \in \{1,\ldots,p(n)\}.$$

In a similar way, let $q(n) := J - p(n)$ be the number of streams with non-positive LLRs at time n; we denote by

$$0 \leq \breve{\lambda}^1(n) \leq \ldots \leq \breve{\lambda}^{q(n)}(n)$$

the (increasingly) ordered sequence of the absolute values of *non-positive* LLRs at time n, i.e., $\{-\lambda^j(n) : \lambda^j(n) \leq 0, j \in [J]\}$, and by $\breve{i}_1(n),\ldots,\breve{i}_{q(n)}(n)$ the corresponding stream indices, i.e.,

$$-\lambda^{\breve{i}_j(n)}(n) = \breve{\lambda}^j(n), \quad \forall\, j \in \{1,\ldots,q(n)\}.$$

Note that stream $\widehat{i}_1(n)$ (resp. $\breve{i}_1(n)$) has the least significant positive (resp. negative) LLR at time n.

4.2. *A candidate rule.* A first approach to the design of a procedure in $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$ is to preserve the *decision* rule of the Sum-Intersection rule, but modify its *stopping* rule, in order to account for the asymmetry in the error metric. This can be done by a procedure $\delta_0(a,b) = (\tau_0, D_0)$ that stops as soon as the following two conditions are satisfied simultaneously: (i) the sum of the k_1 least significant positive LLRs is larger than b, and (ii) the sum of the k_2 least significant negative LLRs is smaller than $-a$. In other words, τ_0 is the first time n such that

$$(28)\quad (i)\ \ \widehat{\lambda}^1(n) + \cdots + \widehat{\lambda}^{k_1}(n) \geq b, \quad \text{and} \quad (ii)\ \ \breve{\lambda}^1(n) + \cdots + \breve{\lambda}^{k_2}(n) \geq a,$$

whereas D_0 rejects, upon stopping, the null hypothesis only in streams with positive LLR. Formally,

$$(29)\qquad \begin{aligned} \tau_0 &= \inf\left\{ n \geq 1 : \sum_{j=1}^{k_1} \widehat{\lambda}^j(n) \geq b \ \text{ and } \ \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} \breve{\lambda}^j(n) \geq a \right\}, \\ D_0 &= \left\{ j \in [J] :\ \lambda^j(\tau_0) > 0 \right\} = \left\{ \widehat{i}_1(\tau_0), \ldots, \widehat{i}_{p(\tau_0)}(\tau_0) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where here and henceforth we adopt the following convention:

$$\widehat{\lambda}^i(n) = \infty, \text{ if } i > p(n), \qquad \text{and} \qquad \breve{\lambda}^j(n) = \infty, \text{ if } j > q(n).$$

Similarly to the Sum-Intersection rule, δ_0 does not require strong evidence from each individual stream in order to stop. Indeed, upon stopping, the values of $\hat{\lambda}^{k_1}$ and $\check{\lambda}^{k_2}$ may be very close to b and a, respectively. As a result, there may be insufficient evidence for the hypotheses that correspond to the $(k_1 - 1)$ least significant positive statistics and the $(k_2 - 1)$ least significant negative statistics, making them the anticipated false positives and false negatives, respectively.

We will see that, with an appropriate selection of the thresholds a and b, δ_0 can indeed control both generalized familywise error rates, for any k_1 and k_2. However, unless $k_1 = k_2 = 1$, δ_0 in general *fails* to achieve the optimal asymptotic performance. Intuitively, this failure is due to the fact that δ_0 implicitly requires *symmetry* in the two target error probabilities ($\alpha = \beta$), in the number of allowed false positives and false negatives ($k_1 = k_2$), and in the signal strength of the various streams ($\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I}$). In fact, when all three conditions are satisfied, δ_0 turns out to be asymptotically optimal. However, even if one of them is violated, the asymptotic optimality of δ_0 is not preserved. We make these statements precise in Subsection 4.7.

4.3. *The Leap rule.* Before we describe the proposed rule, it is useful to gain more intuition regarding the scenarios in which δ_0 may fail; this will suggest how δ_0 should be improved.

Thus, consider the following *hypothetical* situation. Let A be the subset of streams with signals and let B be a subset of ℓ streams with *noise*, i.e., $B \subset A^c$ with $|B| = \ell$, and suppose that $\ell < k_1$. Moreover, suppose that the hypotheses in all streams with signals have very strong evidence, and that the hypotheses in B are "much harder" than in the other streams with noise, in the sense that

$$\mathcal{I}_1^j \gg \mathcal{I}_0^{i_1} \gg \mathcal{I}_0^{i_2}, \quad \forall\, j \in A, \quad i_1 \in A^c \setminus B, \quad i_2 \in B.$$

In this case, requirement (i) in (28) will be quickly satisfied, but the streams in B will slow down the growth of the statistic in (ii), i.e., the sum of the k_2 least significant negative LLRs. Moreover, the ℓ streams in B will most likely belong to the $k_1 - 1$ false positives we are allowed to make.

Based on these observations, it is tempting to make the following modifications to δ_0, in order to eliminate the negative impact of the streams in B. First, we reject upon stopping the null hypothesis in the ℓ *streams with the least significant negative LLRs, in addition to the streams with positive LLR*. Then we are left with only $(k_1 - 1) - \ell$ additional false positives. Thus, the second modification is to strengthen criterion (i) in (28) and require that the sum of the $k_1 - \ell$ least significant positive LLRs be larger than b upon stopping. Further, we relax criterion (ii) in (28) by requiring that the sum of the *next* k_2 least significant negative statistics be smaller than $-a$.

If we denote by $\widehat{\delta}_\ell = (\widehat{\tau}_\ell, \widehat{D}_\ell)$ the procedure that incorporates the above modifications, then

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\tau}_\ell &:= \inf\left\{ n \geq 1 : \sum_{j=1}^{k_1-\ell} \widehat{\lambda}^j(n) \geq b \ \text{ and } \sum_{j=\ell+1}^{\ell+k_2} \breve{\lambda}^j(n) \geq a \right\}, \\ \widehat{D}_\ell &:= \{\widehat{i}_1(\widehat{\tau}_\ell), \ldots, \widehat{i}_{p(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)}(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)\} \cup \{\breve{i}_1(\widehat{\tau}_\ell), \ldots, \breve{i}_\ell(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\ell \in \{0, \ldots, k_1 - 1\}$, and again we omit the dependence on a, b in order to lighten the notation.

By the same token, if there are $\ell < k_2$ streams *with signal* in which the testing problem is much harder than in other streams, it is reasonable to expect that δ_0 may be outperformed by a procedure $\breve{\delta}_\ell = (\breve{\tau}_\ell, \breve{D}_\ell)$ that is

defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\breve{\tau}_\ell &:= \inf\left\{ n \geq 1 : \sum_{i=\ell+1}^{\ell+k_1} \widehat{\lambda}^i(n) \geq b \ \text{ and } \ \sum_{j=1}^{k_2-\ell} \breve{\lambda}^j(n) \geq a \right\} \\ \breve{D}_\ell &:= \{\widehat{i}_{\ell+1}(\breve{\tau}_\ell), \ \dots \ , \widehat{i}_{p(\breve{\tau}_\ell)}(\breve{\tau}_\ell)\}.\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k_2 - 1\}$. Note that when $\ell = 0$ we recover (τ_0, D_0) in both families we introduced, i.e., $(D_0, \tau_0) = (\widehat{D}_0, \widehat{\tau}_0) = (\breve{D}_0, \breve{\tau}_0)$. Fig. 1 provides a visualization of these stopping rules.

$\hat{\tau}_2$: $\left[\hat{\lambda}^4(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^3(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^2(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^1(n) > 0 \geq -\check{\lambda}^1(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^2(n)\right] \geq -\check{\lambda}^3(n)$

$\hat{\tau}_1$: $\left[\hat{\lambda}^4(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^3(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^2(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^1(n) > 0 \geq -\check{\lambda}^1(n)\right] \geq -\check{\lambda}^2(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^3(n)$

τ_0: $\left[\hat{\lambda}^4(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^3(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^2(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^1(n)\right] > 0 \geq -\check{\lambda}^1(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^2(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^3(n)$

$\check{\tau}_1$: $\left[\hat{\lambda}^4(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^3(n) \geq \hat{\lambda}^2(n)\right] \geq \hat{\lambda}^1(n) > 0 \geq -\check{\lambda}^1(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^2(n) \geq -\check{\lambda}^3(n)$

Fig 1: Set $J = 7$, $k_1 = 3$, $k_2 = 2$. Suppose at time n, $p(n) = 4, q(n) = 3$. Each rule stops when the sum of the terms with solid underline exceeds b, and at the same time the sum of the terms with dashed underline is below $-a$. Upon stopping, the null hypothesis for the streams in the bracket are rejected. Note that by convention, $\check{\lambda}^4(n) = \infty$, which makes the stopping rule $\hat{\tau}_2$ have only one condition to satisfy.

Since we do not know in advance whether each "difficult" streams has signal or noise, our proposal is to combine $\{\widehat{\delta}_\ell, 0 \leq \ell < k_1\}$ and $\{\breve{\delta}_\ell, 1 \leq \ell < k_2\}$, i.e., to stop as soon as any of these procedures does so, and use the corresponding decision rule upon stopping. If multiple stopping criteria are satisfied at the same time, we then use the decision rule that rejects the most null hypotheses. Formally, the proposed procedure $\delta_L = (T_L, D_L)$ can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_L &= \min\left\{ \min_{0 \leq \ell < k_1} \widehat{\tau}_\ell, \ \min_{1 \leq \ell < k_2} \breve{\tau}_\ell \right\}, \\ D_L &= \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq \ell < k_1, \widehat{\tau}_\ell = T_L} \widehat{D}_\ell \right) \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{1 \leq \ell < k_2, \breve{\tau}_\ell = T_L} \breve{D}_\ell \right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

We will refer to δ_L as "Leap rule", because $\widehat{\delta}_\ell$ (resp. $\breve{\delta}_\ell$) "leap" across the ℓ least significant negative (resp. positive) LLRs.

4.4. *Error control of the Leap rule.* We proceed to show how to select the thresholds a, b to guarantee the desired error control for the Leap rule. For this purpose, we start with a lemma that shows how to select the thresholds for procedures $\widehat{\delta}_\ell$, $1 \le \ell < k_1$ and $\breve{\delta}_\ell$, $1 \le \ell < k_2$.

LEMMA 4.1. *Assume that (6) holds. Fix $A \subset [J]$. Let $B_1 \subset A^c$ with $|B_1| = k_1$, and $B_2 \subset A$ with $|B_2| = k_2$.*

(i) Fix any $0 \le \ell < k_1$. For any event $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}_{\widehat{\tau}_\ell}$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(B_1 \subset \widehat{D}_\ell) \le C_\ell^{k_1} e^{-b}, \quad \mathsf{P}_A(B_2 \subset \widehat{D}_\ell^c, \Gamma) \le e^{-a} \mathsf{P}_{A \setminus B_2}(\Gamma).$$

(ii) Fix any $0 \le \ell < k_2$. For any event $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}_{\breve{\tau}_\ell}$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(B_1 \subset \breve{D}_\ell, \Gamma) \le e^{-b} \mathsf{P}_{A \cup B_1}(\Gamma), \quad \mathsf{P}_A(B_2 \subset \breve{D}_\ell^c) \le C_\ell^{k_2} e^{-a}.$$

PROOF. The proof is based on the change of measure argument similar to that of Theorem 3.1, and can be found in Appendix A.2. □

We are now ready to establish the error control result for the Leap rule.

THEOREM 4.1. *Assume (6) holds. For any $a, b > 0$ and $A \subset [J]$,*

$$\mathsf{P}_A(|D_L \setminus A| \ge k_1) \le Q_1 e^{-b}, \quad \mathsf{P}_A(|A \setminus D_L| \ge k_2) \le Q_2 e^{-a}$$

where $Q_1 = 2^{k_1} C_{k_1}^J$ and $Q_2 = 2^{k_2} C_{k_2}^J$. In particular, $\delta_L \in \Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha, \beta)$ when the thresholds are selected as follows:

$$a = |\log(\beta)| + \log(Q_2), \quad b = |\log(\alpha)| + \log(Q_1). \tag{33}$$

PROOF. We will only establish the upper bound for $\mathsf{P}_A(|A \setminus D_L| \ge k_2)$, since the other inequality can be established similarly. Observe that

$$\{|A \setminus D_L| \ge k_2\} \ \subset \ \cup_{B \subset A : |B| = k_2} \{B \subset D_L^c\}.$$

Since the union consists at most $C_{k_2}^J$ events, by Boole's inequality, it suffices to show that the probability of each event is upper bounded by $2^{k_2} e^{-a}$. Fix an *arbitrary* $B \subset A$ with $|B| = k_2$. Further observe that

$$\{B \subset D_L^c\} \subset \cup_{\ell=0}^{k_1-1} \hat{\Gamma}_{B,\ell} \bigcup \cup_{\ell=1}^{k_2-1} \check{\Gamma}_{B,\ell}, \quad \text{where}$$
$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{B,\ell} := \{B \subset \widehat{D}_\ell^c\} \cap \{D_L = \widehat{D}_\ell\}, \quad \breve{\Gamma}_{B,\ell} := \{B \subset \breve{D}_\ell^c\}.$$

By Boole's inequality it follows that $\mathsf{P}_A(B \subset D_L^c)$ is upper bounded by

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{k_1-1} \mathsf{P}_A(\hat{\Gamma}_{B,\ell}) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k_2-1} \mathsf{P}_A(\check{\Gamma}_{B,\ell}) \le \sum_{\ell=0}^{k_1-1} e^{-a} \mathsf{P}_{A\setminus B}(D_L = \hat{D}_\ell) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k_2-1} C_\ell^{k_2} e^{-a}$$
$$\le e^{-a} + e^{-a} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k_2-1} C_\ell^{k_2} \right) \le 2^{k_2} e^{-a},$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemma 4.1, and the second from the fact that $\{D_L = \hat{D}_\ell\}$ are disjoint events. Thus, the proof is complete. □

4.5. *Asymptotic upper bound on the expected sample size of the Leap rule.* For any $A \subset [J]$ and $i = 0, 1$ let

$$\mathcal{I}_i^{(1)}(A) \le \ldots \le \mathcal{I}_i^{(|A|)}(A)$$

be the increasingly ordered sequence of $\{\mathcal{I}_i^j : j \in A\}$. Furthermore, for any $1 \le \ell \le u \le J$ define

$$\mathcal{D}_i(A; \ell, u) := \sum_{j=\ell}^{u} \mathcal{I}_i^{(j)}(A),$$

with the convention that $\mathcal{I}_i^{(j)}(A) = \infty$ for any $j > |A|$. The following lemma provides an asymptotic upper bound on the expected sample size of the stopping times that compose the stopping time of the Leap rule.

LEMMA 4.2. *Suppose that either the complete convergence (9) holds for each $j \in [J]$, or only the SLLN (7) holds and each λ^j has independent increments. For any $A \subset [J]$, as $a, b \to \infty$, we have for every $0 \le \ell < k_1$,*

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\widehat{\tau}_\ell] \le \max \left\{ \frac{b(1+o(1))}{\mathcal{D}_1(A; 1, k_1 - \ell)} \, , \, \frac{a(1+o(1))}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c; \ell+1, \ell+k_2)} \right\}, \tag{34}$$

and for $0 < \ell < k_2$,

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\check{\tau}_\ell] \le \max \left\{ \frac{b(1+o(1))}{\mathcal{D}_1(A; \ell+1, \ell+k_1)} \, , \, \frac{a(1+o(1))}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c; 1, k_2 - \ell)} \right\}. \tag{35}$$

PROOF. The proof can be found in Appendix A.3. □

If thresholds are selected according to (33), then the upper bounds in (34) and (35) take the following form

$$\widehat{L}_\ell(A;\alpha,\beta) := \max\left\{\frac{|\log\alpha|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A;1,k_1-\ell)}\ ,\ \frac{|\log\beta|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c;\ell+1,\ell+k_2)}\right\} \quad \text{for } \ell < k_1,$$

$$\breve{L}_\ell(A;\alpha,\beta) := \max\left\{\frac{|\log\alpha|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A,\ell+1,\ell+k_1)}\ ,\ \frac{|\log\beta|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c,1,k_2-\ell)}\right\} \quad \text{for } \ell < k_2.$$

Then the main result of this subsection is that the following quantity

$$L(A;\alpha,\beta) := \min\left\{\min_{0\le\ell<k_1}\widehat{L}_\ell(A;\alpha,\beta)\ ,\ \min_{0\le\ell<k_2}\breve{L}_\ell(A;\alpha,\beta)\right\} \tag{36}$$

provides an asymptotic upper bound on the expected sample size of the Leap rule, when its thresholds are selected according to (33).

THEOREM 4.2. *Suppose that the conditions in Lemma 4.2 hold, and the thresholds in the Leap rule are selected such that* $\delta_L \in \Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$ *and* $a \sim |\log(\beta)|, b \sim |\log(\alpha)|$, *e.g. according to* (33). *Then, for any* $A \subset [J]$ *we have as* $\alpha,\beta \to 0$

$$\mathsf{E}_A[T_L] \le L(A;\alpha,\beta)\,(1+o(1)).$$

PROOF. It follows from Lemma 4.2, and the definition of T_L in (32). □

4.6. *Asymptotic optimality of the Leap rule.* In order to establish the asymptotic optimality of the Leap rule, it suffices to show that $L(A;\alpha,\beta)$ is an asymptotic lower bound on the expected sample size of procedures in the class $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$. This is the content of the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.3. *Assume* (7) *holds. Then for any* $A \subset [J]$ *we have*

$$\inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)} \mathsf{E}_A[T] \ge L(A;\alpha,\beta)\,(1+o(1)), \quad \textit{as} \quad \alpha,\beta \to 0.$$

The proof of this theorem relies on similar ideas as the proof of Theorem 3.2, and requires an analogous result to Lemma 3.1. In order to state this result, let us denote by

$$\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A) = \{C \subset [J] : |C \setminus A| < k_1 \ \text{ and } \ |A \setminus C| < k_2\}, \tag{37}$$

the collection of sets that are "close" to A, according to our error metric.

LEMMA 4.3. *Let* $A \subset [J]$, $B \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$, *and* $\alpha,\beta > 0$.

1. *If* $|B| \geq k_1$ *and* $|B^c| \geq k_2$, *then there exists* $B_1^*, B_2^* \subset [J]$ *such that*

$$(i)\ |B \setminus B_1^*| = k_1,\ |B_2^* \setminus B| = k_2, \qquad (ii)\ \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_1^*}} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_2^*}} \geq L(A;\alpha,\beta)$$

2. *If* $|B| < k_1$, *then there exists* $B_2^* \subset [J]$ *such that*

$$(i)\ |B_2^* \setminus B| = k_2, \qquad (ii)\ \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_2^*}} \geq L(A;\alpha,\beta).$$

3. *If* $|B^c| < k_2$, *there exists* $B_1^* \subset [J]$ *such that*

$$(i)\ |B \setminus B_1^*| = k_1, \qquad (ii)\ \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_1^*}} \geq L(A;\alpha,\beta).$$

PROOF. It can be found the Appendix A.4. □

We can now proceed with the proof of Theorem 4.3.

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3. Fix $A \subset [J]$. By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, it suffices to show for every $q \in (0,1)$ we have:

$$\liminf_{\alpha,\beta\to 0} \inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)} \mathsf{P}_A\left(T \geq qL(A;\alpha,\beta)\right) \geq 1. \tag{38}$$

Fix $q \in (0,1)$ and let (T,D) be any procedure in $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$. Then, by the definition of the class $\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$ in (37) we have

$$1-(\alpha+\beta) \leq \mathsf{P}_A\left(D \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)\right) = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)} \mathsf{P}_A(D=B).$$

Fix $B \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$, and let $\eta > 0$. First, we assume that $|B| \geq k_1$ and $|B^c| \geq k_2$. Then $\mathsf{P}_A(D=B)$ is upper bounded by $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{II}$, where

$$\mathrm{I} = \mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B_1^*}(T) < \log(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}), D=B\right) + \mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B_2^*}(T) < \log(\frac{\eta}{\beta}), D=B\right)$$

$$\mathrm{II} = \mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B_1^*}(T) \geq \log(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}), \lambda^{A,B_2^*}(T) \geq \log(\frac{\eta}{\beta}), D=B\right),$$

where the sets B_1^* and B_2^* are selected to satisfy the conditions in Case 1 of Lemma 4.3. Then, $|B \setminus B_1^*| \geq k_1$ and $|B_2^* \setminus B| \geq k_2$, and consequently

$$\mathsf{P}_{B_1^*}(D=B) \leq \alpha \ \text{ and } \ \mathsf{P}_{B_2^*}(D=B) \leq \beta.$$

Thus, by change of measure $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_{B_1^*}$ and $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_{B_2^*}$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A\left(\lambda^{A,B_i^*}(T) < \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right), D = B\right) \le \eta, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2$$

which shows that $\mathrm{I} \le 2\eta$. Moreover, it is obvious that

$$\mathrm{II} \le \epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta} + \mathsf{P}_A(T \ge qL(A;\alpha,\beta),\ D = B), \quad \text{where}$$
$$\epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta} := \mathsf{P}_A\left(T < qL(A;\alpha,\beta),\ \lambda^{A,B_1^*}(T) \ge \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right), \lambda^{A,B_2^*}(T) \ge \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right)\right).$$

But by the construction of B_1^* and B_2^* we have

$$L(A;\alpha,\beta) \le \ell_{\alpha,\beta} := \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_1^*}} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_2^*}},$$

consequently

$$\epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta} \le \mathsf{P}_A\left(T < q\ell_{\alpha,\beta},\ \ \lambda^{A,B_1^*}(T) \ge \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\alpha}\right), \lambda^{A,B_2^*}(T) \ge \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\beta}\right)\right),$$

and from Lemma B.2 it follows that $\epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta}$ goes to 0 as $\alpha, \beta \to 0$.

Putting everything together, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(D = B) \le 2\eta + \epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta} + \mathsf{P}_A(T \ge qL(A;\alpha,\beta), D = B). \tag{39}$$

In a similar way we can show that equation (39) remains valid when $|B| < k_1$ or $|B^c| < k_2$. Thus summing over $B \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$ we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(D \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)) \le 2Q\eta + \epsilon_{\alpha,\beta} + \mathsf{P}_A(T \ge qL(A;\alpha,\beta), D \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)),$$

where $Q = |\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)|$ is a constant, and $\epsilon_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{B\in\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)} \epsilon^B_{\alpha,\beta}$. Since each summand goes to 0, we have $\epsilon_{\alpha,\beta} \to 0$ as $\alpha, \beta \to 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathsf{P}_A(T \ge qL(A;\alpha,\beta)) \ge 1 - (\alpha + \beta) - 2Q\eta - \epsilon_{\alpha,\beta}$$

The proof is complete after taking the infimum over the class $\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)$, letting $\alpha, \beta \to 0$ and letting $\eta \to 0$. □

The asymptotic optimality for the Leap rule follows immediately from Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3.

THEOREM 4.4. *Assume the assumptions in Theorem 4.2 holds. Then, for any $A \subset [J]$, we have that as $\alpha, \beta \to 0$,*

$$\mathsf{E}_A\left[T_L(a,b)\right] \sim L(A;\alpha,\beta) \sim \inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_{k_1,k_2}(\alpha,\beta)} \mathsf{E}_A[T].$$

4.7. *Discussion.* When $k_1 = k_2 = 1$, i.e., in the case of the classical familywise error control, the Leap rule, as well as the procedure δ_0 (defined in (29)), coincide with the Intersection rule, δ_I (defined in (23)). The asymptotic optimality of the Intersection rule was established by Song and Fellouris (2016), under the assumption that each stream has i.i.d. observations. Therefore, Theorem 4.4 generalizes this result beyond the i.i.d. setup.

It is interesting to ask whether δ_I and δ_0 preserve this asymptotic optimality property when k_1 and k_2 are not both equal to 1. In the following corollary we show that the answer is positive when the following conditions are satisfied simultaneously:

$$k_1 = k_2, \quad \alpha = \beta, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I} \quad \forall\, j \in [J]. \tag{40}$$

However, in Section 5.2 we will illustrate numerically that when even one of these conditions is violated, both δ_0 and δ_I fail to be asymptotically optimal.

COROLLARY 4.1. *Suppose that (40) holds and let the two thresholds be equal, i.e., $a = b$, in both δ_0 and δ_I. Furthermore, let b be selected such that $\delta_0, \delta_I \in \Delta_{k_1,k_1}(\alpha,\alpha)$ and at the same time $b \sim |\log(\alpha)|$ for δ_0 and $b \sim |\log(\alpha)|/k_1$ for δ_I. This can be achieved, for example, if we set $b = |\log(\alpha)| + \log(C_{k_1}^J)$ for δ_0 and $b = (|\log(\alpha)| + \log(C_{k_1}^J))/k_1$ for δ_I. If additionally the conditions in Lemma 4.2 are satisfied, then for any $A \subset [J]$ we have as $\alpha \to 0$ that*

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\tau_0] \sim \mathsf{E}_A[T_I] \sim \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{k_1 \mathcal{I}} \sim \inf_{(T,D)\in\Delta_{k_1,k_1}(\alpha,\alpha)} \mathsf{E}_A[T].$$

PROOF. The error control for δ_0 follows by setting $\ell = 0$ in Lemma 4.1. The error control for the Intersection rule δ_I can be established by a simple modification of the proof of Lemma 4.1. If assumption (40) holds, then from (36) it follows that for every $A \subset [J]$ we have

$$L(A,\alpha,\alpha) = \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{k_1 \mathcal{I}}.$$

Further, setting $\ell = 0$ for τ_0, and $k = 1$ for T_I in (34), we have as $b \to \infty$

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\tau_0(b,b)] \le \frac{b}{k_1\mathcal{I}}(1+o(1)), \quad \mathsf{E}_A[\tau_I(b,b)] \le \frac{b}{\mathcal{I}}(1+o(1)).$$

Thus, if b is selected as in the statement of the corollary, then the quantity $L(A,\alpha,\alpha)$ provides an asymptotic power bound for both $\mathsf{E}_A[\tau_0]$ and $\mathsf{E}_A[\tau_I(b,b)]$. Thus, the proof is complete. □

5. Simulations: generalized familywise error rates. In this section, we present two simulation studies that complement our asymptotic optimality theory for procedures that control generalized familywise error rates (Section 4). The goal of the first study is to compare the (proposed) Leap rule, the Intersection rule and the δ_0 rule in a completely symmetric testing setup where they are all asymptotically optimal. The goal of the second study is to show that the other two rules, unlike the Leap rule, fail to be asymptotically optimal even when one of the symmetry assumptions is slightly violated.

For this comparison, we restrict ourselves to the case that the data in each stream are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). That is, in this section we assume that, for each $j \in [J]$, $\{X_n^j : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with common density f_i^j relative to a σ-finite measure μ^j under H_i^j, where $i = 0, 1$. In this context, our asymptotic optimality theory applies under the first moment condition:

$$\int |\log\left(f_1^j/f_0^j\right)| f_i^j d\mu^j < \infty, \quad i = 0, 1, \quad j \in [J],$$

and the constants $\mathcal{I}_1^j$ and $\mathcal{I}_0^j$ are the Kullback-Leibler information numbers:

$$\mathcal{I}_1^j = \int \log\left(f_1^j/f_0^j\right) f_1^j d\mu^j \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_0^j = \int \log\left(f_0^j/f_1^j\right) f_0^j d\mu^j.$$

Moreover, we assume that each X_n^j is normally distributed with variance equal to 1 and mean θ_i^j, $i = 0, 1$, in which case $\mathcal{I}_1^j = \frac{(\theta_1^j - \theta_0^j)^2}{2} = \mathcal{I}_0^j$.

5.1. *Completely symmetric case.* First, we consider the completely symmetric case where (40) holds. We set $J = 100$, $\theta_0^j = 0$, $\theta_1^j = 0.25$; thus $\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I} = 1/32$. Due to identical hypotheses across streams, the expected sample size(ESS) and the error probabilities of all procedures under consideration depend only on the *number* of signals, not the actual subset of signals. Further, since $\alpha = \beta$, $k_1 = k_2$ and λ^j under H_1^j has the same distribution as $-\lambda^j$ under H_0^j, we can set, without loss of generality, the thresholds in each procedure to be equal, i.e., $a = b$, and it suffices to study its performance under signal configurations where the number of signals is no more than $J/2$.

In Fig. 2a, we fix $k_1 = 4$ and evaluate the ESS of the Leap rule for four different cases regarding the number of signals. We see that, for any given level α, the smallest possible ESS is achieved in the boundary case of no signals ($|A| = 0$). This is because some components in the Leap rule only have one condition to be satisfied in the boundary cases (e.g. $\widehat{\tau}_2$ in Fig. 1).

In Fig. 2b, we fix the number of signals to be $|A| = 50$ and evaluate the Leap rule for different values of k_1. We observe that there are significant savings in the ESS as $k_1 = k_2$ increases and more errors are tolerated.

In Fig. 2c and 2d, we fix $k_1 = 4$ and compare the Leap rule, δ_0 and the Intersection rule for $|A| = 0$ and 50, respectively. In the completely symmetric case under consideration, we have shown that all three procedures are asymptotically optimal. Our simulations suggest that in practice the Leap rule works better when the number of signals $|A|$ is close to 0 or J, but may perform slightly worse than the δ_0 rule when the number of signals $|A|$ is close to $J/2$. On the other hand, the Intersection rule has the worst performance in all cases, especially when the number of signals $|A|$ is close to 0 or J.



(a) Leap rule: $k_1 = 4$, vary $|A|$

(b) Leap rule: $|A| = 50$, vary k_1



(c) $k_1 = 4, |A| = 0$, vary rules



(d) $k_1 = 4, |A| = 50$, vary rules

Fig 2: Completely symmetric case: $J = 100, k_1 = k_2$. The x-axis is $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$ and the y-axis represents the expected sample size under P_A that is required in order to equate the *maximal* generalized familywise error to α.



(a) ESS under P_{A^*} (b) Normalized by $8|\log(\alpha)|$

Fig 3: Asymmetric case: $J = 10, k_1 = k_2 = 2, A^* = \{6, \cdots, 10\}$. The x-axis in both graphs is $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$. For the first, the y-axis represents the corresponding expected sample size(ESS) under P_{A^*}, while for the second, the y-axis is the ratio of the ESS over $8|\log(\alpha)|$.

5.2. *Asymmetric case.* Second, we consider a slightly "asymmetric" case and we set $J = 10$, $k_1 = k_2 = 2$, $\alpha = \beta$, and

$$f_0^j = \mathcal{N}(0,1) \ \ \forall\, j \in [J], \quad f_1^j = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(1/6,1) & \text{if } \ j = 1,2 \\ \mathcal{N}(1/2,1) & \text{if } \ j \geq 3 \end{cases} .$$

In this case, the first two hypotheses are much harder than others: $\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I}^j$, where $\mathcal{I}^j = 1/72$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{I}^j = 1/8$ for $j \geq 3$. When the true subset of signals is $A^* = \{6, \cdots, 10\}$, the optimal asymptotic performance, described by (36), is equal to $8|\log(\alpha)|$.

In Fig. 3a, we plot the ESS against $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$, and the ratio of ESS over $8|\log(\alpha)|$ in Fig. 3b. For the (asymptotically optimal) Leap rule, this ratio tends to 1 as $\alpha \to 0$. In contrast, δ_0 and the Intersection rule clearly have a different "slope" from the Leap rule in Fig. 3a, which indicates that they fail to be asymptotically optimal.

6. Simulations: generalized mis-classification rate. In this section, we present two simulation studies that complement our asymptotic optimality theory for procedures that control the generalized mis-classification rate (Section 3). Specifically, our goal is to compare the proposed Sum-Intersection rule and the Intersection rule in two setups. The first one is the symmetric setup where (24) holds, and in which both rules are asymptotically optimal. The second one is an asymmetric setup, where (24) is (slightly) violated and the Intersection rule fails to be asymptotically optimal. We adopt the same distributional setup as in Section 5; that is, the

observations in each stream are i.i.d. and have normal distribution with unit variance. Since λ^j under P_1^j has the same distribution as $-\lambda^j$ under P_0^j, the performance of each rule under consideration is the same for any subset of signals. Thus we do not need to specify the actual subset of signals.

6.1. *Completely symmetric case.* First, we set $J = 100$, and $\theta_0^j = 0, \theta_1^j = 0.25$, in which case $\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I} = 1/32$. By Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.1, the Sum-intersection rule and the Intersection rule are both asymptotically optimal in this case.

In Fig. 4a, we study the performance of the Sum-Intersection rule for different values of k. We observe that there are significant savings in the ESS as k increases and more errors are tolerated. In Fig. 4b, we compare the Sum-intersection and the Intersection rule for $k = 4$ and $k = 8$. Although both rules enjoy the asymptotic optimality property in this setup, our simulation results suggest that the Sum-Intersection outperforms the Intersection rule for any level of the error probability.



(a) Sum rule: vary k (b) Sum vs Intersection rule

Fig 4: Completely symmetric case: $J = 100$. The x-axis is $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$ and the y-axis represents the expected sample size that is required in order to equate the *maximal* generalized mis-classification error to α.

6.2. *Asymmetric case.* Second, we set $J = 10$, $k = 2$ and

$$f_0^j = \mathcal{N}(0,1) \ \ \forall\, j \in [J], \quad f_1^j = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(1/6,1) & \text{if } \ j = 1 \\ \mathcal{N}(1/2,1) & \text{if } \ j \geq 2 \end{cases} .$$

In this second setup, we have injected a slight violation of the previous symmetric setup. All testing problems are identical apart from the first one, which is much harder than the other ones. Indeed, $\mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}_1^j = \mathcal{I}^j$,



(a) ESS vs $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$ (b) Normalized version

Fig 5: Asymmetric case: $J = 10, k = 2$. The x-axis in both graphs is $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$. The y-axis is the corresponding expected sample size(ESS) in (a), and is the ratio of the ESS over $7.2|\log(\alpha)|$ in (b).

where $\mathcal{I}^j = 1/72$ for $j = 1$, and $\mathcal{I}^j = 1/8$ for $j \geq 2$. Since $k = 2$, the optimal asymptotic performance in this problem is determined by the two most difficult hypotheses and is equal to $7.2|\log(\alpha)|$. In Fig. 5a we plot the expected sample size(ESS) against $|\log_{10}(\alpha)|$ and in Fig. 5b we plot the ratio of ESS over $7.2|\log(\alpha)|$ in Fig. 5b. We observe that this ratio tends to 1 for the asymptotically optimal Sum-Intersection rule, whereas this is not the case for the Intersection rule.

7. Conclusion. In this work we considered two versions of the multiple testing problem. In the first one, the goal is to control the probability of making at least k mistakes, of any kind. In the second one, the goal is to control simultaneously the probabilities of at least k_1 false positives and at least k_2 false negatives. Assuming that the data for the various hypotheses are obtained sequentially in independent streams, we introduced the first asymptotically optimal procedures for each of the two problems under consideration. Furthermore, the proposed procedures were shown in simulation studies to perform better in practice than competitive multiple testing rules.

There are certain questions that remain open for the problem(s) under consideration. First, we conducted a first-order asymptotic analysis, ignoring higher order terms in the approximation to the optimal performance. The latter however appear to be non-negligible in practice (see Fig. 3b). Thus, it is an open problem to obtain a more precise characterization of the optimal performance, as well as examine whether the proposed rules enjoy a stronger optimality property. Second, the number of streams (hypotheses) is treated as constant in our asymptotic optimality theory, but can be very large in

practice. It is interesting to consider an enhanced asymptotic regime, where the number of streams also goes to infinity as the error probabilities vanish. Third, for the error control of the proposed rules, we used very conservative thresholds, which can be impractical for large J. Although simulation techniques can be used to determine sharper threshold values, it is desirable to have a better analytic approximation to the error probabilities.

There are several interesting generalizations of the current problem formulation. One direction is to relax the restrictive assumption that the streams that correspond to the different testing problems are independent. Another direction is to consider composite hypotheses, for example allowing the hypotheses in the streams to be specified up to an unknown parameter vector. Finally, it is interesting to allow for early stopping in some streams, in which case the goal is to minimize the total number of observations in all streams.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF LEMMAS

A.1. Proof of Lemma 3.1. We start with a lemma about sets.

LEMMA A.1. *Let $A, B, \Gamma \subset [J]$. There exists $B^* \subset [J]$ such that*

$$A \triangle B^* \quad \subset \quad \Gamma \quad \subset \; B \triangle B^*$$

PROOF. Define the following disjoint sets:

$$B_1 = B \cap \Gamma, \quad B_2 = B^c \cap \Gamma, \quad A_1 = A \cap \Gamma^c, \quad A_2 = A^c \cap \Gamma^c$$

Clearly, $\Gamma = B_1 \cup B_2$, and $\Gamma^c = A_1 \cup A_2$. Let $B^* = B_2 \cup A_1$.

On one hand, if $j \in B_1$, then $j \in B$ and $j \notin B^*$; if $j \in B_2$, then $j \notin B$ and $j \in B^*$. It implies $\Gamma = B_1 \cup B_2 \subset B \triangle B^*$.

On the other, if $j \in A_1$, then $j \in A$ and $j \in B^*$; if $j \in A_2$, then $j \notin A$ and $j \notin B^*$. Thus $\Gamma^c = A_1 \cup A_2 \subset (A \triangle B^*)^c$, which implies $A \triangle B^* \subset \Gamma$. □

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 3.1 of the main text.

PROOF. Let $C^* \notin \mathcal{U}_k(A)$ such that $\mathcal{D}(A,k) = \mathcal{I}^{A,C^*}$ and set $\Gamma = A \triangle C^*$. Then, clearly $|\Gamma| \geq k$. By Lemma A.1, there exists a set $B^* \subset [J]$ such that

$$A \triangle B^* \quad \subset \quad \Gamma = A \triangle C^* \quad \subset \quad B \triangle B^*.$$

From the second inclusion it follows that $|B \triangle B^*| \geq |\Gamma| \geq k$, which proves (i). From the first inclusion it follows that $A \backslash B^* \subset A \backslash C^*$ and $B^* \backslash A \subset C^* \backslash A$, therefore from (5) we conclude that

$$\mathcal{I}^{A,B^*} = \sum_{i \in A \backslash B^*} \mathcal{I}_1^i + \sum_{j \in B^* \backslash A} \mathcal{I}_0^j \leq \sum_{i \in A \backslash C^*} \mathcal{I}_1^i + \sum_{j \in C^* \backslash A} \mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{I}^{A,C^*},$$

which proves (ii). □

A.2. Proof of Lemma 4.1.

PROOF. We will only prove (i), since (ii) can be shown in a similar way. Fix $0 \le \ell < k_1$. By definition, $\widehat{D}_\ell$ rejects the nulls in the ℓ streams with the least significant non-positive LLR, in addition to the nulls in the streams with positive LLR. Thus,

$$\{B_1 \subset \widehat{D}_\ell\} \subset \bigcup_{M \subset B_1, |M| = k_1 - \ell} \Pi_M \,, \quad \text{where } \Pi_M := \{\lambda^j(\widehat{\tau}_\ell) > 0 \ \ \forall j \ \in M\}.$$

With a change of measure from $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_C$, where $C = A \cup M$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(\Pi_M) = \mathsf{E}_C\left[\exp\{\lambda^{A,C}(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)\}; \Pi_M\right] = \mathsf{E}_C\left[\exp\left\{-\sum_{j\in M}\lambda^j(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)\right\}; \Pi_M\right].$$

By the definition of $\widehat{\tau}_\ell$, on the event Π_M we have $\sum_{j\in M}\lambda^j(\widehat{\tau}_\ell) \ge b$. Thus $\mathsf{P}_A(\Pi_M) \le e^{-b}$. Since the number of such M is no more than $C_\ell^{k_1}$, the first inequality in (i) follows from Boole's inequality.

On the other hand, we observe that on the event $\{B_2 \subset \widehat{D}_\ell^c\}$, we have

$$\sum_{j\in B_2}\lambda^j(\widehat{\tau}_\ell) \le -a.$$

Thus with a change of measure from $\mathsf{P}_A \to \mathsf{P}_{A\setminus B_2}$, we have

$$\mathsf{P}_A(B_2 \subset \widehat{D}_\ell^c, \Gamma) \le \mathsf{E}_{A\setminus B_2}\left[\exp\left\{\sum_{j\in B_2}\lambda^j(\widehat{\tau}_\ell)\right\}; \Gamma\right] \le e^{-a}\mathsf{P}_{A\setminus B_2}(\Gamma),$$

which completes the proof. □

A.3. Proof of Lemma 4.2.

PROOF. We will only prove (34), as the proof of (35) is similar. Fix A. We introduce the following classes of subsets

$$\mathcal{M}_1 = \{B \subset A : |B| = k_1 - \ell\},$$
$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \left\{B \subset A^c : |B| = k_2,\ \mathcal{I}_0^i \ge \mathcal{I}_0^{(\ell+1)}(A^c)\ \forall\, i \in B\right\}.$$

Clearly, we have $\widehat{\tau}_\ell \le \tau'$, where

$$\tau' := \inf\{n \ge 1 : \min_{B\in\mathcal{M}_1}\sum_{i\in B}\lambda^i(n) \ge b \ \text{ and } \ \min_{B\in\mathcal{M}_0}\sum_{j\in B}\lambda^j(n) \le -a,$$
$$\min_{i\in A}\lambda^i(n) > 0 \ \text{ and } \ \max_{j\notin A}\lambda^j(n) < 0\}.$$

Thus, by an application of Lemma B.2, we have

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\tau'] \le \max\left\{ \frac{b}{\min_{B\in\mathcal{M}_1}\sum_{j\in B} I_1^j} \ , \ \frac{a}{\min_{B\in\mathcal{M}_0}\sum_{j\in B} I_0^j} \right\}(1+o(1)).$$

By definition, for any $B_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and $B_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$, we have

$$\sum_{j\in B} I_1^j \ge \mathcal{D}_1(A; 1, k_1-\ell), \quad \sum_{j\in B} I_0^j \ge \mathcal{D}_0(A^c; 1+\ell, k_2+\ell)$$

therefore we conclude that

$$\mathsf{E}_A[\tau'] \le \max\left\{ \frac{b}{\mathcal{D}_1(A; 1, k_1-\ell)} \ , \ \frac{a}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c; 1+\ell, k_2+\ell)} \right\}(1+o(1)),$$

which proves (34). □

A.4. Proof of Lemma 4.3. We start with two lemmas.

LEMMA A.2. *Let $G \subset A \subset F \subset [J]$. Denote $s_1 = |A \setminus G|$ and $s_2 = |F^c|$. Then for any integer n, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(G, 1, n) &\le D_1(A, 1+s_1, n+s_1), \\ D_0(F\setminus A, 1, n) &\le D_0(A^c, 1+s_2, n+s_2) \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Let's start with the first inequality. We can assume $n \le |G|$, since otherwise both sides are equal to ∞.

Fix some $1 \le i \le n$. Then clearly the i^{th} smallest element in $\{\mathcal{I}_1^j : j \in G\}$ is no larger than the $(i+|A\setminus G|)^{th}$ element in $\{\mathcal{I}_1^j : j \in A\}$. Thus the first inequality follows from the definition of the D_1 function.

For the second inequality, it follows from the previous argument by replacing G by $F\setminus A$, A by A^c, and $\mathcal{I}_1^j$ by $\mathcal{I}_0^j$. □

LEMMA A.3. *Let ℓ_1, ℓ_2 be two non-negative integers such that $\ell_1 < k_1$ and $\ell_2 < k_2$. Then for any $A \subset [K]$, and $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we have*

$$\frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, 1+\ell_2, k_1-\ell_1+\ell_2)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, 1+\ell_1, k_2-\ell_2+\ell_1)} \ge L(A; \alpha, \beta).$$

PROOF. Let's consider the case that $\ell_1 \geq \ell_2$. When $\ell_1 \leq \ell_2$, the result can be proved in a similar way. Thus, denote $\ell = \ell_1 - \ell_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, 1+\ell_2, k_1-\ell_1+\ell_2)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, 1+\ell_1, k_2-\ell_2+\ell_1)} \\ = & \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, 1+\ell_2, k_1-l)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, 1+\ell+\ell_2, k_2+\ell)} \\ \geq & \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, 1, k_1-\ell)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, 1+\ell, k_2+\ell)} \\ = & \widehat{L}_\ell(A;\alpha,\beta) \quad \geq \quad L(A;\alpha,\beta) \end{aligned}$$

where the last line used the definition of $\widehat{L}_\ell$ and L. □

With above two lemmas, we're ready to present the proof of Lemma 4.3. We illustrate the intuition of the following proof in Figure 6.

PROOF. Fix A and $B \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$. By definition of the class $\mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$,

$$\ell_1 := |B \setminus A| < k_1, \quad \ell_2 := |A \setminus B| < k_2.$$

First, consider the case that $|B| \geq k_1$, which implies $|A \cap B| \geq k_1 - \ell_1$. Thus we can find $\Gamma_1 \subset A \cap B$ such that

$$\Gamma_1 = k_1 - \ell_1, \quad \sum_{i \in \Gamma_1} \mathcal{I}_1^i = \mathcal{D}_1(A \cap B, 1, k_1 - \ell_1)$$

Let's consider $B_1^* := A \setminus \Gamma_1$; it's easy to see

$$A \setminus B_1^* = \Gamma_1, \quad B \setminus B_1^* = \Gamma_1 \cup (B \setminus A)$$

Thus, $|B \setminus B_1^*| = k_1$; further, viewing $A \cap B$ as G in the Lemma A.2, and since $\ell_2 = |A \setminus B|$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{A,B_1^*} = \sum_{i \in \Gamma_1} \mathcal{I}_1^i = \mathcal{D}_1(A \cap B, 1, k_1 - \ell_1) \leq \mathcal{D}_1(A, 1+\ell_2, k_1 - \ell_1 + \ell_2).$$

Second, consider the case that $|B^c| \geq k_2$, which implies $|A^c \cap B^c| \geq k_2 - \ell_2$. Thus there exists $\Gamma_2 \subset A^c \cap B^c$ such that

$$\Gamma_2 = k_2 - \ell_2, \quad \sum_{j \in \Gamma_2} I_0^j = \mathcal{D}_0(A^c \cap B^c, 1, k_2 - \ell_2)$$

Let's consider $B_2^* := A \cup \Gamma_2$; it's easy to see

$$B_2^* \setminus A = \Gamma_2, \quad B_2^* \setminus B = \Gamma_2 \cup (A \setminus B)$$

Then $|B_2^* \setminus B| = k_2$. further, viewing $A \cup (A^c \cap B^c)$ as F in the Lemma A.2, and since $\ell_1 = |B \setminus A| = |F^c|$, we have

$$\mathcal{I}^{A,B_2^*} = \sum_{j \in \Gamma_2} \mathcal{I}_0^j = \mathcal{D}_0(A^c \cap B^c, 1, k_2 - \ell_2) \leq \mathcal{D}_0(A^c, 1 + \ell_1, k_2 - \ell_2 + \ell_1)$$

It remains to show B_1^* and B_2^* satisfy the property (ii) in each case.
Case 1: $|B| \geq k_1$ and $|B^c| \geq k_2$. By construction of B_1^* and B_2^*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{I}^{A,B_1^*}} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{I^{A,B_2^*}} \\ \geq\ & \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, \ell_2 + 1, \ell_2 + k_1 - \ell_1)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, \ell_1 + 1, \ell_1 + k_2 - \ell_2)} \\ \geq\ & L(A; \alpha, \beta) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Lemma A.3.
Case 2: $|B| < k_1$, which implies the following:

$$|A| = |A \setminus B| + |A \cap B| = \ell_2 + |B| - \ell_1 < \ell_2 + k_1 - \ell_1$$

and thus $D_1(A, \ell_2 + 1, \ell_2 + k_1 - \ell_1) = \infty$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{I^{A,B_2^*}} &\geq \frac{|\log(\alpha)|}{\mathcal{D}_1(A, \ell_2 + 1, \ell_2 + k_1 - \ell_1)} \bigvee \frac{|\log(\beta)|}{\mathcal{D}_0(A^c, \ell_1 + 1, \ell_1 + k_2 - \ell_2)} \\ &\geq L(A; \alpha, \beta) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is again due to Lemma A.3.
Case 3: $|B^c| < k_2$. It can be proved in the same way as in case 2. □

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL LEMMAS

In this section, we present two lemmas about general discrete stochastic process, which may be of independent interest.

LEMMA B.1. *Let $\{\xi_i(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two stochastic processes on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$. Suppose that for some positive μ_1, μ_2,*

$$\mathsf{P}\left(\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \xi_i(n) = \mu_i\right) = 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Let c be a fixed constant. Then for any random time T, and any $q \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lim_{b \to \infty} \mathsf{P}\left(T \leq q \frac{b}{\mu_1},\ \xi_1(T) \geq b + c\right) = 0, \tag{41}$$

$$\lim_{a, b \to \infty} \mathsf{P}\left(T \leq q\left(\frac{a}{\mu_1} \bigvee \frac{b}{\mu_2}\right),\ \xi_1(T) \geq a + c,\ \xi_2(T) \geq b + c\right) = 0. \tag{42}$$



Fig 6: The solid area are the streams with signal. The whole set $[J]$ is partitioned into four disjoint sets: $A \setminus B$, $A \cap B$, $B \setminus A$, $A^c \cap B^c$. If $B \in \mathcal{U}_{k_1,k_2}(A)$, then $\ell_1 < k_1$ and $\ell_2 < k_2$.

PROOF. Since c is fixed, we assume $c = 0$ without loss of generality. Denote $N_b = \lfloor q\frac{b}{\mu_1} \rfloor$, and $\epsilon_q = \frac{1}{q} - 1 > 0$. Notice that $\mathsf{P}(T \le q\frac{b}{\mu_1},\ \xi_1(T) \ge b)$ is upper bounded by

$$\mathsf{P}\left(\max_{1\le n\le N_b} \xi_1(n) \ge b\right) \ \le\ \mathsf{P}\left(\frac{1}{N_b}\max_{1\le n\le N_b} \xi_1(n) \ge (1+\epsilon_q)\mu_1\right) \to 0$$

where the convergence follows directly from Lemma A.1 of Fellouris and Tartakovsky (2016). Thus the proof of (41) is compelte.

For the second part, assume (42) doesn't hold. Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, and a sequence (a_n, b_n) with $a_n \to \infty, b_n \to \infty$ such that

$$p_n := \mathsf{P}\left(T \le q(\frac{a_n}{\mu_1} \bigvee \frac{b_n}{\mu_2}),\ S_1(T) \ge a_n,\ S_2(T) \ge b_n\right) \ge \epsilon \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We can assume $a_n/\mu_1 \ge b_n/\mu_2$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since otherwise we can take a sub-sequence, and the following argument will still go through. Thus,

$$\epsilon \ \le\ p_n \ \le\ \mathsf{P}\left(T \le q\frac{a_n}{\mu_1}, S_1(T) \ge a_n\right),$$

which contradicts with (41). Thus the proof is complete. □

REMARK B.1. *Note that in (42), there is no restriction on the way a, b approaching infinity.*

The next lemma provides an upper bound on the expectation of the first time when multiple processes simultaneous cross given thresholds.

LEMMA B.2. *Let $L \geq 2$ and $\{\xi_\ell(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}_{\ell\in[L]}$ be L stochastic processes on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathsf{P})$. Define the stopping time*

$$\nu(\vec{b}) \;:=\; \inf\{n \geq 1 :\; \xi_\ell(n) \geq b_\ell \;\; \textit{for every} \;\; \ell \in [L]\}$$

where $\vec{b} = \{b_1, \dots, b_L\}$. Then for some positive $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L$, we have

$$\mathsf{E}[\nu(\vec{b})] \;\leq\; \max_{\ell\in[L]} \left\{\frac{b_\ell}{\mu_\ell}\right\}(1 + o(1)) \;\; \textit{as} \;\; \min_{\ell\in[L]}\{b_\ell\} \to \infty \tag{43}$$

*if **one** of the following conditions holds: (i). For each $\ell \in [L]$ and any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathsf{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) - \mu_\ell\right| \geq \epsilon\right) < \infty.$$

(ii). For each $\ell \in [L]$, $\{\xi_\ell(n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has independent increment, and

$$\mathsf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) = \mu_\ell\right) = 1.$$

PROOF. Denote $N(\vec{b}) = \max_{\ell\in[L]}\{b_\ell/\mu_\ell\}$, and $\vec{b}_{min} = \min\{b_1, \dots, b_L\}$.

First, assume condition (i) holds. Fix $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and denote $N_\epsilon(\vec{b}) = \left\lfloor N(\vec{b})/(1-\epsilon)\right\rfloor$. By definition of $\nu(\vec{b})$, we have

$$\{\nu(\vec{b}) > n\} \;\subset \bigcup_{\ell\in[L]} \{\xi_\ell(n) < b_\ell\}$$

By Boole's inequality, for $n > N_\epsilon(\vec{b})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{P}(\nu(\vec{b}) > n) &\leq \sum_{\ell\in[L]} \mathsf{P}(\xi_\ell(n) < b_\ell) \leq \sum_{\ell\in[L]} \mathsf{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) < \frac{b_\ell}{N_\epsilon(\vec{b}) + 1}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell\in[L]} \mathsf{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) < (1-\epsilon)\mu_\ell\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell\in[L]} \mathsf{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) - \mu_\ell\right| > \epsilon\mu_\ell\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $n \geq N_\epsilon(\vec{b}) + 1 \geq \frac{N(\vec{b})}{1-\epsilon} \geq \frac{b_\ell}{(1-\epsilon)\mu_\ell}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{E}[\nu(\vec{b})] = \int_0^\infty \mathsf{P}(\nu(\vec{b}) > t)\, dt \;&\leq N_\epsilon(\vec{b}) + 1 + \sum_{n>N_\epsilon(\vec{b})} \mathsf{P}(\nu(\vec{b}) > n) \\
&\leq N_\epsilon(\vec{b}) + 1 + \sum_{\ell\in[L]} \sum_{n>N_\epsilon(\vec{b})} \mathsf{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\xi_\ell(n) - \mu_\ell\right| > \epsilon\mu_\ell\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to condition (i), we have

$$\limsup_{\vec{b}_{min}\to\infty} \frac{\mathsf{E}[\nu(\vec{b})]}{N(\vec{b})} \;=\; \limsup_{\vec{b}_{min}\to\infty} (1-\epsilon)\frac{\mathsf{E}[\nu(\vec{b})]}{N_\epsilon(\vec{b})} \;\le\; 1-\epsilon$$

Since $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary, (43) holds.

Now assume that condition (ii) holds. Clearly, $\nu(\vec{b}) \ge \nu_\ell(b_\ell)$, where

$$\nu_\ell(b_\ell) := \inf\{n \ge 1 : \xi_\ell(n) \ge b_\ell\} \;\text{ for }\; \ell \in [L].$$

Due to condition (ii), we have

$$\liminf_{b_\ell\to\infty} \frac{\nu(\vec{b})}{b_\ell/\mu_\ell} \;\ge\; \lim_{b_\ell\to\infty} \frac{\nu_\ell(b_\ell)}{b_\ell/\mu_\ell} = 1 \;\text{ for }\; \ell \in [L],$$

which implies $\liminf_{\vec{b}_{min}\to\infty} \nu(\vec{b})/N(\vec{b}) \ge 1$. On the other hand, by the definition of $\nu(\vec{b})$, there exists $\ell' \in [L]$ such that

$$\xi_{\ell'}(\nu(\vec{b})-1) < b_{\ell'} \iff \frac{\xi_{\ell'}(\nu(\vec{b})) - b_{\ell'}}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_{\ell'}} \le \frac{\xi_{\ell'}(\nu(\vec{b})) - \xi_{\ell'}(\nu(\vec{b})-1)}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_{\ell'}}.$$

Taking the minimum on the l.h.s., and maximum on the right, we have

$$\min_{\ell\in[L]} \frac{\xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b})) - b_\ell}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_\ell} \le \max_{\ell\in[L]} \frac{\xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b})) - \xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b})-1)}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_\ell}.$$

which implies

$$\frac{N(\vec{b})}{\nu(\vec{b})} \;=\; \max_{\ell\in[L]} \frac{b_\ell}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_\ell} \;\ge\; \min_{\ell\in[L]} \frac{\xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b}))}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_\ell} - \max_{\ell\in[L]} \frac{\xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b})) - \xi_\ell(\nu(\vec{b})-1)}{\nu(\vec{b})\mu_\ell}$$

where the last term will goes to 1 as $\vec{b}_{min} \to \infty$ due to condition (ii). Thus, $\liminf N(\vec{b})/\nu(\vec{b}) \ge 1$ as $\vec{b}_{min} \to \infty$, which together with previous reverse inequality, shows that $\nu(\vec{b})/N(\vec{b}) \to 1$ almost surely as $\vec{b}_{min} \to \infty$. Thus, the proof would be complete if we can show the following:

$$(*) \qquad \mathcal{C}_1 = \left\{ \frac{\nu(\vec{b})}{N(\vec{b})} :\; b_1, \ldots, b_L > 0 \right\} \text{ is uniformly integrable}$$

Define $\mu_{max} = \max\{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_L\} > 0$, $b_{max} = \max\{b_1, \ldots, b_L\}$ and

$$\nu'(c) = \inf\{n \ge 1 : \xi_\ell \ge c \;\text{ for every }\; \ell \in [L]\} \;\text{ for }\; c > 0.$$

By Lemma 4.3 of Fellouris and Tartakovsky (2016), $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{\nu'(c)/c : c > 0\}$ is uniformly integrable. Observe that

$$\nu(\vec{b}) \leq \nu'(b_{max}) \ , \ N(\vec{b}) \geq \frac{b_{max}}{\mu_{max}} \ \Rightarrow \ \frac{\nu(\vec{b})}{N(\vec{b})} \ \leq \ \mu_{max} \frac{\nu'(b_{max})}{b_{max}} \ \in \ \mu_{max} \, \mathcal{C}_2.$$

Since μ_{max} is a constant, $\mathcal{C}_1$ is dominated by a uniformly integrable family. Thus condition $(*)$ holds, and the proof is complete. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant CCF 1514245 and in part by the Simons Foundation under Grant C3663.

REFERENCES

Armitage, P. (1950). Sequential Analysis with More than Two Alternative Hypotheses, and its Relation to Discriminant Function Analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **12** 137-144.

Bartroff, J. (2014). Multiple Hypothesis Tests Controlling Generalized Error Rates for Sequential Data. *ArXiv e-prints*.

Bartroff, J. and Lai, T. L. (2010). Multistage tests of multiple hypotheses. *Communications in Statistics–Theory and Methods* **39** 1597–1607.

Bartroff, J. and Song, J. (2014). Sequential tests of multiple hypotheses controlling type I and II familywise error rates. *Journal of statistical planning and inference* **153** 100–114.

Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 289–300.

Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 1165–1188.

Bogdan, M., Chakrabarti, A., Frommlet, F. and Ghosh, J. K. (2011). Asymptotic Bayes-optimality under sparsity of some multiple testing procedures. *The Annals of Statistics* 1551–1579.

De, S. K. and Baron, M. (2012a). Sequential Bonferroni methods for multiple hypothesis testing with strong control of family-wise error rates I and II. *Sequential Analysis* **31** 238–262.

De, S. K. and Baron, M. (2012b). Step-up and step-down methods for testing multiple hypotheses in sequential experiments. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **142** 2059–2070.

De, S. K. and Baron, M. (2015). Sequential tests controlling generalized familywise error rates. *Statistical Methodology* **23** 88 - 102.

Dragalin, V. P., Tartakovsky, A. G. and Veeravalli, V. V. (1999). Multihypothesis sequential probability ratio tests. I. Asymptotic optimality. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on* **45** 2448–2461.

Dragalin, V. P., Tartakovsky, A. G. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2000). Multihypothesis sequential probability ratio tests. II. Accurate asymptotic expansions for the expected sample size. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on* **46** 1366–1383.

Fellouris, G. and Tartakovsky, A. G. (2016). Multichannel Sequential Detection-Part I: Non-i.i.d. Data. *arXiv 1601.03379*.

Guo, W., He, L., Sarkar, S. K. et al. (2014). Further results on controlling the false discovery proportion. *The Annals of Statistics* **42** 1070–1101.

Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian journal of statistics* 65–70.

Hommel, G. (1988). A stagewise rejective multiple test procedure based on a modified Bonferroni test. *Biometrika* **75** 383–386.

Hommel, G. and Hoffmann, T. (1988). Controlled uncertainty. In *Multiple Hypothesenprüfung/Multiple Hypotheses Testing* 154–161. Springer.

Hsu, P.-L. and Robbins, H. (1947). Complete convergence and the law of large numbers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **33** 25–31.

Lai, T. L. (1981). Asymptotic Optimality of Invariant Sequential Probability Ratio Tests. *Ann. Statist.* **9** 318–333.

Lehmann, E. L. and Romano, J. P. (2005). Generalizations of the familywise error rate. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1138–1154.

Lehmann, E. L., Romano, J. P. and Shaffer, J. P. (2005). On optimality of stepdown and stepup multiple test procedures. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 1084–1108.

Li, Y., Nitinawarat, S. and Veeravalli, V. V. (2014). Universal Outlier Hypothesis Testing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **60** 4066-4082.

Lorden, G. (1977). Nearly-optimal sequential tests for finitely many parameter values. *Ann. Statist.* 1–21.

Malloy, M. L. and Nowak, R. D. (2014). Sequential testing for sparse recovery. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on* **60** 7862–7873.

Marcus, R., Eric, P. and Gabriel, K. R. (1976). On closed testing procedures with special reference to ordered analysis of variance. *Biometrika* **63** 655–660.

Peña, E. A., Habiger, J. D. and Wu, W. (2011). Power-enhanced multiple decision functions controlling family-wise error and false discovery rates. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 556–583.

Romano, J. P. and Shaikh, A. M. (2006). Stepup procedures for control of generalizations of the familywise error rate. *The Annals of Statistics* 1850–1873.

Romano, J. P. and Wolf, M. (2007). Control of generalized error rates in multiple testing. *The Annals of Statistics* 1378–1408.

Song, Y. and Fellouris, G. (2016). Asymptotically optimal, sequential, multiple testing procedures with prior information on the number of signals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.02791*.

Storey, J. D. (2007). The optimal discovery procedure: a new approach to simultaneous significance testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **69** 347–368.

Sun, W. and Cai, T. T. (2009). Large-scale multiple testing under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **71** 393–424.

Tartakovsky, A. G. (1998). Asymptotic Optimality of Certain Multihypothesis Sequential Tests: Non-iid Case. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* **1** 265–295.

Wald, A. (1945). Sequential tests of statistical hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **16** 117–186.

Department of Statistics,
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign,
725 S. Wright Street, Champaign 61820, USA
Email: ysong44@illinois.edu and fellouri@illinois.edu